

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

AMANDA JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

NORDSTROM et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-01813-LK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
EXTEND DEADLINE TO SERVE
DEFENDANTS AND FILE PROOF
OF SERVICE

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Amanda Johnson’s Motion Requesting Additional Time to Serve Defendants. Dkt. No. 54. Ms. Johnson seeks an unspecified amount of additional time to serve Defendants “[d]ue to the extenuating circumstances with the severeness of [her] red eyes” and difficulty seeing “[w]hen using the computer.” *Id.* at 2.

On April 7, 2025, the Court extended for good cause the time for Ms. Johnson to serve Defendants and ordered her to do so within thirty days of that order. Dkt. No. 49 at 3–4. The order provided that “[a]lternatively, Ms. Johnson may file a motion requesting additional time to serve

1 Defendants and establish good cause for such an extension.” *Id.* at 4. Before the thirty-day period
2 elapsed, Ms. Johnson filed this motion for an extension of time to serve. Dkt. No. 54.¹

3 “When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may” extend the time
4 “for good cause[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1). The Court does so here. It GRANTS the motion for an
5 extension, Dkt. No. 54, and extends the time for Ms. Johnson to serve Defendants and file proof
6 of service with the Court within thirty days of the date of this Order. However, the Court cautions
7 Ms. Johnson that this is her last extension; she has had approximately one and a half years to
8 properly initiate her case and serve defendants (including three extensions of time, Dkt. Nos. 14,
9 49, and this Order), and the Court will not grant another extension unless extraordinary
10 circumstances warrant it. Absent timely service on the Defendants, the Court will dismiss this case
11 without prejudice.

12 Dated this 30th day of May, 2025.

13 

14 Lauren King
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 ¹ Ms. Johnson’s motion also asks why the summons at Dkt. No. 51 was issued. *Id.* at 1. The Clerk issued the summons
24 because Ms. Johnson filed it with her proposed amended complaint, Dkt. No. 44 at 8; *see also* Dkt. No. 49 at 3, and
when a plaintiff presents a properly completed summons to the Clerk, the Clerk is required to “sign, seal, and issue it
to the plaintiff for service on the defendant,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(b).